5: Schwimmer E-4,5 (1966-1967) 1973
OJ23 Orokaiva OJ23
Mountain Orokaiva

462
464

TABLE II/5 (*continued*)

Activity	*Total hours*	*Percentage contrib.**
Both		*Men*
Paid work	1,128.8	56
Other crops – harvest	1,109.0	54
Sick – personal	442.6	53
Yam – harvest	412.6	53
Coffee – process	398.4	53
Collecting firewood	234.1	52
Social obligations – mourning	783.9	51
Other crops – market	66.9	51
Church services	1,946.2	46
Meetings	898.7	44
Fishing	165.0	44
Council work	824.2	42
Taro – maintain	2,551.6	37

* Where one sex carries out more than two-thirds of the work and where the total amount exceeds .01 per cent (29.0 hours) of the total hours active for the whole sample.

there is a ritual prohibition, for which I shall later quote the mythological charter, to hold a feast at all. 433 437

In any case, there seem to be two basic limitations to the size of a feast. First, the custom of restricting the number of guests to the inhabitants of *one* village, usually of about the same size as the inviting village. There are of course many variations to this custom but the principle of limitation is usually present. Secondly, the generosity shown to the guests, though outwardly most impressive, is restricted by the amount the guests can physically carry away. Though the food lying on the feasting platform looks inexhaustible to the observer, and the guests are capable of carrying away a heroic amount of food after a feast, the overall economic impact is minor. 527 527 574 628

Waddell remarks most interestingly that, in comparison with the main crops (taro, bananas and sugar-cane), a far higher proportion of dry season crops enter the exchange network. This applies especially to sago, breadfruit, sweet potatoes and yams. Waddell does not discuss nuts, but these are often given to friends and function as the small change of sociability. Both *tauga* and *puga* are stored for the season of shortage; betelnut is a traditional trade item. All vegetable produce is nowadays considered suitable for marketing. Villages near Popondetta have far more opportunity to sell or barter produce than the villages on the Mount Lamington foothills. 439 437 438

It is customary for animal food to enter the exchange network, either as a gift or as part of a festive meal to which guests are invited. Meat is ceremonial food, eaten for instance to mark the settlement of a quarrel. It is considered somewhat [261]

[TEXT CONTINUED ON PAGE 31]

S: Schwimmer E-4,5 (1966-1967) 1973
OJ23 Orokaiva OJ23
Mountain Orokaiva

improper to eat meat without introducing some element of gift exchange, very much like 'party food' in our own society.

In general, people take any wood they need from their own land. The only record I have of transactions involving wood concerns the obtaining of less common building materials for houses. My informants made a clear distinction between gifts of bush trees and gifts of sago. The former kind create no specific debt but whenever sago is taken a return gift is expected, because, I was told, sago is a cultivated plant.

With regard to feathers and *hambo*, attitudes differ as between areas where raw materials are plentiful and areas where they are rare. On the Mount Lamington foothills they seldom enter the exchange network – perhaps once a generation, during a ceremony of uncommon importance. On the alluvial plains, they are a frequent trade item.[8] Of other items of traditional trade, betelnuts and lime are the most important. Betelnut grows only on the foothills; lime is made of shells collected on the seashore. It was, and is, therefore common to exchange one for the other, as betelnut can be chewed only together with lime and betelnut chewing is as popular a social activity among the Orokaiva as it is throughout New Guinea and Indonesia. A peppery plant called *hingi* (piper betel) is always chewed with the other two ingredients. This again grows best on the hills, so that it is often exchanged with the betelnuts. The alluvial plains are in a poor bargaining position with regard to the betelnut complex as they produce none of the ingredients from their own land. It may be partly for this reason that they are accustomed to accumulating animal products and to using these as objects of trade.

By far the largest number of exchanges take place within a village, only a minority of transactions occurring between members of different village

TABLE II/7

ACQUISITION OF 'HAMBO' AND 'DI'
(*Source*: Crocombe and Hogbin 1963: 51; Rimoldi 1966: 80)

	Sivepe		*Inonda*	
	Hambo	*Di*	*Hambo*	*Di*
Inheritance, cash value ($)	48.40	17.60	18.60	5.70
Percentage	53%	40%	17%	12%
Cash Purchase, value ($)	9.30	4.50	36.10	2.00
Percentage	10%	10%	33%	4%
Bride price or other exchanges, value ($)	17.70	6.50	48.30	17.90
Percentage	19%	14%	44%	38%
Made or caught, value ($)	16.60	15.40	5.90	21.10
Percentage	18%	35%	5%	45%
Total, value: ($)	92.00	44.00	108.90	46.70

5: Schwimmer E-4,5 (1966-1967) 1973
OJ23 Orokaiva OJ23
Mountain Orokaiva

the ill feeling that has built up; usually any attempt to assign guilt would lead only to further conflict, as the record is too tangled to be satisfactorily sorted out. The party which decides to hold the feast and to invite the other side may or may not admit that it regards itself as guilty, and that it owes the other side a debt. The past is simply set aside and the host acts as though the feast is a free gift, an expression of disinterested love and generosity. The guest at the feast accepts the same fiction.

Accordingly, if we regard a feast as an occasion for social exchange, as the Orokaiva undoubtedly do, the basic objects of exchange are repentance and forgiveness. Sometimes a few words are exchanged between host and guest to express this notion of forgiving and forgetting, though I do not suppose this is invariably the case. On one occasion I invited a man to have a feast with me, after some months during which he had been acting unpleasantly towards me for reasons I did not quite understand. I must have unwittingly offended him. After the meal he said: 'I did not really know you before now.' This implied that he was willing to forgive and forget whatever had previously annoyed him. At the same time, the fact of my inviting him indicated that I was sorry for whatever I had done wrong. What we were really exchanging was a willingness to change our attitudes to each other, which involved some effort for both of us. Whether this is, in practice, done genuinely or only ritually does not concern me here as I am discussing feasts from the viewpoint of Orokaiva collective representations. When two groups feast together, each has the obligation to feel sorry for any offence he has caused and to forgive any offence caused by the other side. It is only thus that the feast can interrupt the inherent enmity between man and man. Through the sharing of meat the two sides re-enact the communion existing in primordial times when men, as brothers, shared the body of Totoima.

An essential part of any feast is that the host should offer meat to his guest. But it is a total misapprehension of Orokaiva social philosophy to believe that it is the meat that is being exchanged for forgiveness. If that were so, it would not be essential for the two parties to consume it together. Certainly, if I have offended another person, I may make him a gift of meat in reparation. This is often done. But the reconciliation between the parties is not effected by such a gift alone. There must in addition be commensality (the common eating of taro) and communion (the common eating of meat). The meat used in such a communion is not an object of exchange. It is better described as a mediating element which makes possible the actual transaction (i.e. the exchange of repentance and forgiveness). Orokaiva are quite definite that there can be no true repentance and forgiveness between men unless meat is consumed between them. One may therefore regard meat as a *necessary* mediating element in this transaction.

Perhaps the most useful insight to be derived from Orokaiva social philosophy is that the natural form of a social relationship is cyclical and moves regularly from hostility to reconciliation and back to hostility. In other words, the Orokaiva do not see the model of a friendship, as do Westerners, in the form of a perpetual harmony, so that every conflict that arises is regarded as a deviation from the model. On the contrary, Orokaiva consider conflict as intrinsic to the model. This is true also in the discussion of quite intimate relationships: father and son, husband and wife, and so on. The perfect relationship is not one where

5: Schwimmer E-4,5 (1966-1967) 1973
OJ23 Orokaiva OJ23
Mountain Orokaiva

and the male is also the most illustrious victim of the killer – the victim whose name and spirit is adopted by the killer. This theme, widely reported among headhunters, is strongly emphasised in Orokaiva culture, as Williams recognised. In the myth discussed here, and in several others, these complementary male and female aspects of the taro are indicated by the presence of a pair of *dema*, probably always siblings of opposite sex, and clearly marked as such in the present myth.

In addition to father, mother and twins, the myth contains a fifth character, the man from Managalasi, whose peculiarly male role is the hunting of animals. The marriage between him and Totoima's daughter lays down the Orokaiva principle that taro is a female product given to a man whereas meat is a male product given to a woman. In a number of myths I collected on the origin of marriage, that institution is set up by the male hero's action of bringing home meat to a woman instead of eating it in the bush, as was customary before marriage existed.

If female nature, in its pure state, is found in the taro garden and male nature, in its pure state, in the jungle, then it follows that human beings, being born of a man and a woman, have a mixed nature. In Totoima this dual nature is imperfectly developed (for he eats taro in the manner of a wild pig); similarly it is, at first, imperfectly developed in his son who does not hunt and has a purely taro nature. It is only when the man from Managalase has replaced the son's taro entrails with animal entrails that the latter has the power to defeat his father. He is then superior to his father because he has a fully human nature which is symbolised for instance by his manner of killing, with a club rather than the teeth (tusks), as did Totoima.

The analysis of this myth has enabled us to understand more precisely the sense in which it may be said that taro is, as Sahlins put it, symbolic of 'mother'. The Orokaiva do speak of taro as 'our mother' and the ideas they have in mind when they do so have been explained above. Taro is two things: it is a gift from a woman to her husband, and it is the offspring of the woman's womb inasmuch as she is identified with the taro goddess. The woman gives most of the taro-children she collects in the garden to her husband and others of her household, but she may extend this munificence by giving taro to others, i.e. by acting towards others as a quasi-wife or as though they were part of her household. Gifts of taro always have this intimate and deeply personal character as though the receiver was made part of the donor's household. The woman bears herself proudly, being pleased at having grown and cooked the food well; her attitude is formal and ceremonious, thus emphasising the importance of the gift and her respect for the recipient; at the same time she shows a certain solicitude, as though the recipient must be very hungry and very much in need of this meal.

3. *Taro as Mediator of Social Relations*

Gifts of taro may mediate either the establishment or perpetuation of a social relationship. But the ritual context of the gifts differs considerably. By far the most frequent type are gifts which maintain relationships; these are made by every Sivepe household every day. In the twenty-eight days for which I took

241 of "dry" gardening, with fire and the digging stick as the essential tools, and either long term rotation of previously occupied areas or breaking in of new forest land. "The immediate family . . . is a self sufficient unit" and "the Orokaiva words for 'work' and 'garden' are one and the same." Con-
621 sistent with this mobile economic base, settlements are rarely more than hamlet size, with "hardly more than a dozen houses" on the average. Materials for housing are readily available, so that residence can be easily shifted.

The hamlet is based normally on patrilocal-patrilineal principles of organization, with a known strong tendency for new groups to form by "hiving off." Clan affiliations are
[614] reckoned from quite recent ancestors, so that at times a given clan may all be in one settlement, though more usually scattered through several closely related settlements. The
592 generally monogamous family units are under the "immediate
62 authority of the father," while the affairs of the local living
622 units are under loose supervision by the hamlet and clan elders, centered on a "men's house" and working together, usually with one strong senior man as "leader." Personal
422 property consists of mobile goods such as tools and utensils, clothing, and body ornaments.

181 In spite of ethnic similarities over a wide region, Williams speaks of the Orokaiva as being a "more than usually quarrelsome and disunited people"—a strong statement to make in the New Guinea setting. Their pre-pacification history was marked by "feuds, dispersals . . . a veritable whirlpool of strife, migration, and counter-migration." Beaver, too, refers to their "turbulent and restless life . . . migration was, in
[154] the main, a matter of attacking, fleeing, and pursuing." Supernatural weapons in the form of sorcery were especially feared. Even for Papuans, the Orokaiva proved to be unusually
[562] hostile and resistant to whites. Women were often seen ac-
[726] companying the war parties, carrying food and weapons, and sometimes joining in fights. Williams goes on to say that
[628] while the "elementary small sympathy-groups" (the local kin and settlement units, and to a lesser extent the dispersed
[728] clan units) were tightly knit, their external relations were precarious. "There were peacemakings or truces, but the truce was always a fragile one, and no (settlement) lived
361 in permanent security." "Hiving off" occurred sometimes
241 as the result of a "quarrel and the fear of retaliatory magic,"
[518] but more often it was "simply the lax method of horticulture which necessitates the clearing of many areas in succession and sometimes a temporary settlement on a distant site."
361 Another factor could have been food scarcities which tend
261 to occur in exceptionally dry southeast winter seasons. During this period, north and west Lamington area is in a rainshadow zone, and people may have to scatter out to live on wild
931 roots and fruits. The implication of this is that even the
165 excision of the 4,000 persons from the Orokaiva group who were killed involved no extensive shattering of valued ties.

361 Williams and others judge that with the modern pacifica-
178 tion, the Orokaiva have tended to disperse in even smaller living units than before. This appears to apply particularly
[199] to the relatively densely populated Lamington slopes, though a few instances of larger aggregations approaching a village
361 type also occurred, particularly as a result of Mission influ-
571 ence. Over against this greater dispersal, the people have;